

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, DOC 20231 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO FILING DATE APPLICATION NO.

09/812,765

03/20/2001

Richard J. Terrien

RICK-04937

8883

23535

7590

10/04/2002

MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP 101 HOWARD STREET **SUITE 350** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

EXAMINER

POPOVICS, ROBERT J

PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT

1724

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 5% |
|----|
| " |

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | 1. | 1 |
|---|---|---|--|------------------------------------|----------|
| Office Action Summary | 09/812,765 | | erren | et | a1. |
| | Application No. O9/ 8/2, 765 Examiner Popos | | Group Art Unit | | |
| | • | | | | |
| - The MAILING DATE of this communication appears | on the cover sheet be | eneath the co | rrespondence a | ddress | _ |
| Period for Reply | \mathcal{I} | . | | | |
| Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION. | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defaul Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the materm adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | eply within the statutory mir t, expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro tute, cause the application t illing date of this communica | nimum of thirty (3 om the mailing da to become ABAN | 0) days will be cons ate of this communi IDONED (35 U.S.C. | sidered til ication. § 133). | mely. |
| Status (0/15/ | or (IDS) | | | | · |
| Status Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | · | | |
| This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowance excep accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 193 | t for formal matters, pro | osecution as t 3. | to the merits is | closed | in |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| Claim(s) -16 8-16 | | is/are p | pending in the ap | plicatio | n. |
| | | | | onsider | ation. |
| □ Claim(s) | | is/are a | allowed. | | |
| Claim(s) 1-7 | | is/are r | ejected. | | |
| Claim(s) | | is/are | objected to. | | atio- |
| ☐ Claim(s) | | are sul require | oject to restrictio ement | n or ele | caon |
| Application Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on | is □ annroved | • | | | |
| ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objection. | | | | | |
| | otos to by allo Exacilities | - | | | |
| ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d) | | (a) (d) | | | |
| ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority | under 35 0.5.0. 9 119 (| (a/-(u). | | | |
| □ All □ Some* □ None of the: | raceived | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority documents have been Certified copies of the priority documents have been | received in Application | No | | | |
| □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents | | | | | |
| in this national stage application from the Internation | | '.2(a)) | | | |
| *Certified copies not received: | | | | | |
| Attachmont(a) | _ | | | | |
| Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper | No(s) | Interview Sur | nmary, PTO-413 | | |
| Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 | | Notice of Info | ormal Patent App | lication | , PTO-15 |
| ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO- | 948 | Other | | | |
| | Action Summary | | | | |
| | | | | | -1 |

Applicant(s)

Application/Control Number: 09/812,765 Page 2

Art Unit: 1724

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-7, drawn to a METHOD FOR REMOVING AN OIL CONTAMINANT FROM THE SURFACE OF AN AQUEOUS SOLUTION, classified in class 210. subclass 776.
 - II. Claims 8-16 (two claims numbered "11"), drawn to a DEVICE/SYSTEM FOR REMOVING AN OIL CONTAMINANT FROM THE SURFACE OF AN AQUEOUS SOLUTION, classified in class 210, subclass 241.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions of Group I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process, such as in the removing of debris from a swimming pool surface.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 09/812,765 Page 3

Art Unit: 1724

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II and vice versa, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. During a telephone conversation with Ms. Jaen Andrews on September 30, 2002 a provisional election was made *without* traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-7. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 8-16 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

- 6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).
- 7. It is requested that Applicants *cancel the non-elected claims* with their next response to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 09/812,765 Page 4

Art Unit: 1724

9. Claims 1-2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gore (US 5.948,266).

See col. 1, lines 54-57 where industrial application is discussed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. Claims 3-4 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gore (US 5,948,266).

Claims 3 and 6 specify the solution to be enclosed in a tank. While the preferred use of the Gore skimmer is to remove gas or oil sheens from the surface waters in a marina, Gore expressly teaches that his skimmer may be used in "certain industrial situations and liquid purification operations" (col. 1, lines 54-57). In view of this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the skimmer of Gore in industrial applications involving solutions stored in tanks. It is submitted that such applications would be readily apparent to the skilled artisan. With respect to claim 7, it is submitted that use of the skimmer of Gore would have been obvious in various "manufacturing" processes, in order to remove tramp oil from machine tool coolant for example.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1724

In claim 4, it is unclear what Applicants intend by the recitations "way oils" and "hobbing oils."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Popovics whose telephone number is (703) 308-0684.

RJP

September 30, 2002

ROBERT POPOVICS
PRIMARY EXAMINER